

that household goods and personal effects was put back on the tax rolls. It certainly was not addressed by a majority of the court as I understand it. It's true that Judge Shanahan made some reference in his portion of the decision of being illogic of what two other judges had indicated, but aside from that, I think it would add an ingredient in the discussion of a proposed constitutional amendment by the public that would not be perceived to be a legal question but one that somehow or other they were being coerced into voting for the amendment rather than the legal issue that certainly is there. I'd be hesitant then at this point to vote yes on this amendment, recognizing the arguments of those who are proponents of it, but more of one that the impact of that being adopted, of it being adopted, I think would adversely affect any ballot issue that would be on in either May or November if that's where it ends up.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, it's often been said that it's more expensive to collect a tax on household goods and personal effects than we would receive or the subdivisions would receive in revenue from those items. We know, of course, that for insurance purposes virtually every insurance agent will insure personal property, household effects and personal effects for one-half the value of the house. If you choose to do it otherwise, you may of course by option list either a greater or lesser amount, if not, that is the amount that is used. It would be a very simple procedure thereby to collect the proper amount of tax due upon those items so that argument falls upon hollow ground I think. Secondly, in regard to the comments made by Senator Warner as to whether or not someone might feel coerced into voting for the amendment because if they did not, the tax might go back on their own personal property, I can't think of any better reason for someone to vote for or against an amendment than how it affects them personally. It is relatively easy for me to vote to place a stiff tax upon intangibles because my holdings in that area are extremely limited. It is relatively difficult for me to vote for a proposal that will raise the tax on real estate and that is all a matter of how it happens to be at the moment. But to argue that we can get a fair vote on the constitutional amendment that would exempt personal property from taxation if, in fact, failure to adopt the amendment might mean that 500,000 persons who otherwise don't pay a dime of personal taxes are going to pay some brings to the argument some degree of reasonableness that hasn't been